

# UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

## Research at Birmingham

### CD Manuscript B and the Rule of the Community— Reflections on a Literary Relationship

Hempel, Charlotte

DOI:

[10.1163/156851709X473987](https://doi.org/10.1163/156851709X473987)

#### *Document Version*

Early version, also known as pre-print

#### *Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Hempel, C 2009, 'CD Manuscript B and the Rule of the Community— Reflections on a Literary Relationship', *Dead Sea Discoveries*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 370-387. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156851709X473987>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

#### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

Published version copyright Brill online DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/156851709X473987>

#### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

#### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

6 941 words

*CD Manuscript B and the Community Rule – Reflections on a Literary  
Relationship*<sup>\*</sup>

CHARLOTTE HEMPEL, UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

*1. Introduction*

One of the most important and debated literary relationships in the corpus of the Dead Sea Scrolls is that between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule.<sup>1</sup> The relationship of both compositions to one another has been a central issue in Scrolls scholarship ever since it became clear that the Cairo Damascus Document shares the same provenance as those new texts soon after the discovery of the first scrolls. The

---

<sup>\*</sup> An earlier version of this piece of research was presented at the SBL International Meeting in Vienna in July 2007. I would like to thank the chairs of the Qumran section, Profs. Armin Lange and Kristin de Troyer, for the invitation and the participants for their comments, esp. Profs. Hanan Eshel, Hindy Najman, and Lawrence Schiffman. I am also grateful to Prof. Steven Fraade for making one of his recent publications available to me in an instant.

<sup>1</sup> The literature devoted to this issue is large. For a recent contribution which includes further literature see, Hilary Evans Kapfer, 'The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes Toward the Temple as a Test Case,' *DSD* 14 (2007): 152-177. Most recently see also the succinct and valuable discussion in Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad. A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*, Leiden: Brill, 2009, pp. 163-173.

publication of eight Cave 4 manuscripts of the Damascus Document and ten Cave 4 manuscripts of the Community Rule has inaugurated a new phase in this enquiry.<sup>2</sup>

Both in the Community Rule and in the Damascus Document, legal material is often embedded in a non-legal framework such as admonitory and narrative material in the Damascus Document and admonitory material in the Community Rule. As far as the Damascus Document is concerned Steven Fraade has recently offered a thorough discussion of the relationship of its narrative and legal components suggesting that the document as a whole is best seen as “an anthology that was drawn upon so as to provide performative “scripts” [...] for the annual covenant renewal ceremony...”.<sup>3</sup> The issue of a connection between law, discipline, and obedience on the one hand, and communal liturgy on the other hand is also evident in both documents. Thus, the final section of the Damascus Document as now attested in the Cave 4 manuscripts contains an explicit reference to a gathering of the inhabitants of the camps in the third month (4QD<sup>a</sup> 11:1-20 // 4QD<sup>d</sup> 16 // 4QD<sup>e</sup> 7 i-ii), often thought to be a community internal covenant renewal ceremony.<sup>4</sup> In the Community Rule as attested

---

<sup>2</sup> For a recent overview see C. Hempel, ‘Texts, Scribes and Scholars: Reflections on a Busy Decade in Dead Sea Scrolls Research,’ *Expository Times* 120 (2009): 272-276.

<sup>3</sup> S. Fraade, ‘Ancient Jewish Law and Narrative in Comparative Perspective: The Damascus Document and the Mishnah’, in A. Edrei and S. Last Stone (eds.), *Dine Israel. Studies in Halakhah and Jewish Law*, New York / Tel Aviv, 2007, pp. 65-99, here p. 87.

<sup>4</sup> See J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII. The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD 18), Oxford: Clarendon, 1996, esp. pp. 76-78, 162-167; C. Hempel, *The*

in 1QS, 4QpapS<sup>a</sup>, 4QS<sup>b</sup>, 4QpapS<sup>c</sup>, and 4QS<sup>h</sup> communal legislation and disciplinary issues are also presented in a broader liturgical context as witnessed by the inclusion of a covenant ceremony (or fragments thereof) in these manuscripts.<sup>5</sup> This liturgical bridge between some of the S manuscripts and D has also been noted by Ben Zion Wacholder recently when he observes, "...the author of the Rule of the Community begins his composition with MTA's [i.e.D's, C.H.] finale."<sup>6</sup>

The presence of significant overlap as well as differences between various parts of both documents has regularly occupied scholars. Chief among the overlapping texts are versions of the penal code in the Community Rule (1QS 6:24-7:25 // 4QS<sup>d</sup> V,1 // 4QS<sup>e</sup> I,4-15, II,3-8 // 4QS<sup>g</sup> 3,2-4; 4a-b, 1-7; 5a-c, 1-9; 6a-e 1-5), the Damascus

---

*Laws of the Damascus Document* (STDJ 29), Leiden: Brill, 1998, esp. pp. 175-185; H. Stegemann, 'More Identified Fragments of 4QD<sup>d</sup> (4Q269)', in *RQ* 18 (1998): 497-509, esp. pp. 503-509; and Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, p. 165.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. for an overview see Table 1 in P. S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX. Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26), Oxford: Clarendon, 1998, pp. 1-2 and S. Metso, *The Serekh Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9), London: T&T Clark, 2007.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Ben Zion Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document. The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary*, Leiden, Brill, 2007, p. 367. Wacholder does not note the presence of S manuscripts such as 4QS<sup>d</sup> that lack the liturgical material found in 1QS 1-4. Thus, although his observation is illuminating, the overall picture to be drawn from the full spectrum of S manuscripts needs to be more nuanced.

Document (CD 14:18b-22 // 4QD<sup>a</sup> 10 i-ii // 4QD<sup>b</sup> 9 vi // 4QD<sup>d</sup> 11 i-ii; 4QD<sup>e</sup> 7 i), and also in 4QMiscellaneous Rules (*olim* Serekh Damascus, 4Q265 4 i 2-ii 2), and 11Q29 (Fragment Related to Serekh ha-Yahad).<sup>7</sup>

Although most extensively attested, the penal code is only one of several passages indicative of a close and complex literary relationship between the Community Rule and the Damascus Document. We may refer also to the intriguing overlapping requirement that a priest must be present in a place of ten. Sarianna Metso, John

---

<sup>7</sup> See J. M. Baumgarten, 'The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code,' *JJS* 43 (1992): 268-276; C. Hempel, 'The Penal Code Reconsidered', in M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen (eds.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, Leiden: Brill, 1997, pp. 337-348; Jutta Jokiranta, 'Social Identity in the Qumran Movement: The Case of the Penal Code', in P. Luomanen, I. Pyysiäinen, and R. Uro (eds.), *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism. Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science*, Leiden: Brill, 2007, pp. 277-298; S. Metso, "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule", in J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (eds.), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center, 4-8 February 1998*, Leiden: Brill, 2000, 85-93; A. Shemesh, 'The Scriptural Background of the Penal Code in the *Rule of the Community* and *Damascus Document*', *DSD* 15 (2008): 191-224 and C. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, Leiden: Brill, 2004, pp. 148-152.

Collins, Eyal Regev, and myself have written on the latter topic recently.<sup>8</sup> Another very complicated area is the presence of *rabbim* terminology in both documents.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> See John Collins, 'The Yahad and "The Qumran Community,"' in C. Hempel and J. Lieu (eds.), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission. Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*, Leiden: Brill, 2006, pp. 81-96; C. Hempel, 'Emerging Communal Life and Ideology in the S Tradition,' in F. García Martínez and M. Popović (eds.), *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 70), Leiden: Brill, 2008, pp. 43-61; *eadem*, '1QS 6:2c-4a – Satellites or Precursors of the Yahad?,' in Adolfo Roitman and Larry Schiffman (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture*, Leiden: Brill, forthcoming proceedings of a 2008 Jerusalem conference; S. Metso, 'Whom Does the Term Yahad Identify?,' in Hempel and Lieu (eds.), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, pp. 213-235; Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran. A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007, chapter 4. Further, A. Schofield, 'Rereading S: A New Model of Textual Development in Light of the Cave 4 *Serekh* Copies,' *DSD* 15 (2008): 96-120.

<sup>9</sup> For a recent treatment of this see Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, pp. 163-196 and 269-300. See also Hempel, *Laws of the Damascus Document*, pp. 81-85, 122-123, 135-136, 138-139, 178, 190; *eadem*, *The Damascus Texts*, Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 2000, pp. 51-52 and now also Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, pp. 172-173.

Metso recently referred to this type of evidence as “inter-textual.”<sup>10</sup> Schofield’s assessment of the relationship between S and D as reflecting a “constant dialogic exchange” also captures the phenomena well.<sup>11</sup> The most pertinent evidence of this kind is collected in Eibert Tigchelaar’s ‘Annotated List of Overlaps and Parallels in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran and Masada’ that forms part of volume XXXIX in the DJD Series.<sup>12</sup> The terminology Tigchelaar employs differs slightly from the one I have used above in as far as he refers to ‘overlaps’ in the context of various copies of the same composition and otherwise employs the term ‘parallels’ when referring to material from different compositions. The material he has collected is based chiefly on the indications of such evidence provided by various editors in the DJD Series with some of his own examples as well.<sup>13</sup> There is a lack of consistency, however, between the terminology employed in Tigchelaar’s table and individual DJD volumes with DJD 26 – the 4QS volume edited by Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes – identifying both parallel manuscripts of the Community Rule and overlaps with other documents under the same heading as ‘Parallels.’<sup>14</sup> This is also the practice in Joseph

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. S. Metso, ‘Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History from Rule Texts Found at Qumran,’ *DSD* 11 (2004): 315-335, esp. p. 330.

<sup>11</sup> Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, p. 164, see also p. 166.

<sup>12</sup> E. Tigchelaar, ‘Annotated List of Overlaps and Parallels in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran and Masada’, in E. Tov (ed.), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD, 39), Oxford: Clarendon, 2002, pp. 285-322, esp. pp. 319-320.

<sup>13</sup> Cf., ‘Annotated List of Overlaps and Parallels,’ p. 287.

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, p. 139.

Baumgarten's edition of the Cave 4 manuscripts of the Damascus Document in DJD 18.<sup>15</sup> To designate two such radically different pieces of evidence with the same term is both imprecise and revealing. Tigchelaar's efforts to list both types of correspondences separately are certainly a move in the right direction. Fraade coined the phrase 'synoptic 'intersections' in a recent comparative study of the Damascus Document and the Mishnah.<sup>16</sup> A close analysis of such overlaps sheds important light on a number of enquiries:

1. The literary resemblances and differences between portions of text, such as the penal code, in a number of compositions can be drawn upon to try and map out the ways in which the material evolved.
2. The presence of shared blocks of material in texts that are otherwise different in important ways indicates that these blocks originated independently of their place in the final documents in at least one of the texts and conceivably in both. It is hard to imagine, for instance, that two different authors composed the same list of offences often in the same sequence in both the Damascus Document and the Community Rule.
3. Because the Damascus Document and the Community Rule deal with matters of communal life, those passages where the texts differ and those where they overlap will inevitably be crucial in discussions of the communities that are portrayed in those texts, be those portrayals historically accurate or not.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> See Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, p. 162.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Fraade, 'Ancient Jewish Law and Narrative in Comparative Perspective,' p. 93.

<sup>17</sup> On the latter question see, P. R. Davies, 'Redaction and Sectarianism in the Qumran Scrolls,' in F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst and C. J. Labuschagne (eds.), *The*



An interesting further question we might want to raise is whether we are able to draw up a *profile of intersections*. It emerges, first of all, very clearly from Tigchelaar's tables that the *Serekh* and the Damascus Document together with 4Q265 (Miscellaneous Rules *olim* Serekh Damascus) are the hub of what Fraade calls synoptic intersections in the non-biblical scrolls, attesting by far the largest number of instances.<sup>18</sup> In other words, the Community Rule and the Damascus Document are - for one reason or another - more closely related inter-textually than other Qumran texts. Moreover, my impression is that we find a proliferation of such inter-textual evidence in the area of community discipline, cf. the penal codes as well as the less formally cohesive penal material in CD 20 and 1QS 8 to be dealt with in more detail below. In other words, the texts are closest and more elaborate when it comes to the stick rather than the carrot. Also interesting to note is the presence of penal material both at the end of the Admonition and near the end of the Damascus Document as a whole as now preserved in 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11, 4QD<sup>d</sup> 16, and 4QD<sup>e</sup> 7. Although, to be precise, we are no longer in a position to say categorically that CD 20 preserves the end of the

---

*Scriptures and the Scrolls. Studies in Honour of A. S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Leiden: Brill, 1992, pp. 152-163; S. Metso, 'In Search of the Sitz im Leben of the Community Rule,' in D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 306-315; *eadem*, 'Methodological Problems'; and Maxine L. Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document. A Methodological Study*, Leiden: Brill, 2002.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Tigchelaar, 'Annotated List of Overlaps and Parallels,' pp. 319-320.

Admonition without at least noting the fluid to and fro between law and admonitory material in the document as it now emerges.<sup>19</sup> It suffices to quote one of the more recent statements on this issue by Ben Zion Wacholder who rightly notes, “the two themes [i.e. legal and admonitory] are constantly interwoven”.<sup>20</sup> What we can say with some justification, it seems to me, is that when the Damascus Document was redacted and reached its final form discipline and penal material (‘the stick’) was clearly a major issue.<sup>21</sup> Such matters play a large role in the Community Rule also where they are found repeatedly in the central columns of the manuscripts. In short, disciplinary material plays a major role at three levels:

- ❖ in the Community Rule
- ❖ in the Damascus Document
- ❖ and where both texts intersect when they intersect.

---

<sup>19</sup> See H. Stegemann, ‘Towards Physical Reconstructions of the Qumran Damascus Document Scrolls,’ in J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (eds.), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center, 4-8 February 1998* (STDJ 34), Leiden: Brill, 2000, pp. 177-200.

<sup>20</sup> B. Z. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, p. 12.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Carol Newsom’s description of the community that emerges from her reading of the Serekh ha-Yahad in light of the work of Michel Foucault as a ‘disciplinary institution’, cf. C. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, esp. pp. 95-101.

This seems to indicate that the issue of discipline and commitment was particularly crucial when the Damascus Document was completed and when the Community Rule was compiled.<sup>22</sup>

#### *CD 20:1-8 and the Community Rule*

It is exactly another such passage which has often been noted as exemplifying a close relationship between the Community Rule and the Damascus Document that I would like to deal with in more detail in this article. I am referring to CD 20:1b-8a and its relationship to 1QS 8-9. In 1972 Jerome Murphy-O'Connor pointedly observed, "Had CD XX,1c-8a been found as an isolated fragment it would have been presumed that it belonged to the *Rule*..."<sup>23</sup> In 1987 Michael Knibb noted in his comments on CD 20 that CD 20:1b-8a "stands apart from the rest of the passage. It deals with the temporary expulsion of erring members and is similar in character to 1QS 8:16b-

---

<sup>22</sup> Alison Schofield is correct when she also emphasizes that the inter-textual encounters appear to be located near or at the point of the Damascus Document's final redaction. Cf. "In the history of ideas, these two texts parallel each other in many ways, and the final redactor(s) of D, at least, must have been familiar with the other (S) tradition.", *From Qumran to the Yahad*, p. 165, see also pp. 167-168.

<sup>23</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 'A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX,33-XX,34', *RB* 79 (1972): 544-64, pp. 554-555.

9:2.”<sup>24</sup> In 1991 Philip Davies wrote, “I shall consider here what I regard as the strongest individual case of direct correspondence between CD and 1QS, namely sections of the material in each document which overlap both literarily and, it would seem, also historically: CD XIX,33b-XX,34 and 1QS VIII-IX.”<sup>25</sup> Davies concluded his 1991 article with the statement, “...one could argue [...] that the group reflected in CD XX and 1QS IX are one and the same, and indeed, at more or less the same moment.”<sup>26</sup>

The purpose of this article is to revisit this fascinating discussion in light of the texts published since the earlier studies by Murphy-O'Connor, Knibb, and Davies appeared, in particular the publication of the Cave 4 manuscripts of the Community Rule.<sup>27</sup> One of the most striking developments we can now trace, but could not then, is the fact that the material with the closest overlap between 1QS 8-9 and CD 20 is

---

<sup>24</sup> M. A. Knibb *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 300 2), Cambridge: CUP, 1987, p. 71, cf. also p. 72.

<sup>25</sup> P. R. Davies, ‘Communities at Qumran and the Case of the Missing “Teacher”,’ *RQ* 15 (1991): 275-286, here p. 276.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. 1QS 9:9-10 and CD 20:31-32.

<sup>26</sup> ‘Communities at Qumran and the Case of the Missing “Teacher”,’ p. 283.

<sup>27</sup> See esp. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, and S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21), Leiden: Brill, 1997.

absent from 4QS<sup>e</sup>.<sup>28</sup> Metso has explained 4QS<sup>e</sup>'s considerably shorter text as a witness to a more original stage in the growth of S.<sup>29</sup> Others prefer to explain the evidence of 4QS<sup>e</sup> as a secondarily shortened text, either shortened deliberately (so Philip Alexander<sup>30</sup>) or accidentally (so Emile Puech and Jim VanderKam<sup>31</sup>). Metso's hypothesis seems more likely to me.<sup>32</sup> This is important because it might indicate that the close relationship between 1QS 8-9 and CD 20 outlined by Davies and others is actually confined to a particular block of material in 1QS that may be secondary.

---

<sup>28</sup> See 4QS<sup>e</sup> III esp. line 6. Cf. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, pp. 144-149.

<sup>29</sup> See S. Metso, 'The Primary Results of the Reconstruction of 4QS<sup>e</sup>', *JJS* 44 (1993): 303-308.

<sup>30</sup> P.S. Alexander, 'The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal', *RQ* 17 (1996): 437-453.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. E. Puech, 'Recension: J. Pouilly, La Règle de la Communauté de Qumrân. Son évolution littéraire,' *RQ* 10 (1979): 103-111 and J. C. VanderKam, 'Messianism in the Scrolls,' in E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994, pp. 211-234, here p. 213 where VanderKam argues that a mechanical error may have resulted in 4QS<sup>e</sup>'s shorter text.

<sup>32</sup> For further recent endorsements of Metso's line of argument see E. J. C. Tigchelaar, 'The Scribe of 1QS,' in S. M. Shalom *et al.* (eds.), *Emanuel. Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 439-452, esp. p. 452 and Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, p. 108.

It deserves mentioning that this particular part of the Damascus Document has provoked a great deal of interest because the two mediaeval Cairo manuscripts attest radically different though related readings just before our passage sets in. Unfortunately CD manuscript A breaks off just before the passage we are looking at. It would have been fascinating to be able to read its version of these lines, if they existed. Alas, the evidence of the 4QD manuscripts offers no parallel for the first half of CD 20.<sup>33</sup> Most recently a monograph by Stephen Hultgren, and studies by Menahem Kister and Liora Goldman have moved this debate further.<sup>34</sup>

*The Texts (CD 20:1b-8a and 1QS 8:16b-9:2; 9:8-11a // 4QS<sup>d</sup> VI:8b.11-12; VII:1-3.7-9)*<sup>35</sup>

Before presenting the texts, let me briefly explain my system of visual enhancement which also summarizes the key points I would like to make. I left out of consideration

---

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave XVIII*, p. 3. For a recent analysis see Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, pp. 102-103.

<sup>34</sup> See S. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community* (STDJ 66), Leiden: Brill, 2007, esp. pp. 5-76; M. Kister, 'The Development of the Early Recensions of the Damascus Document', *DSD* 14 (2007): 61-76; and Liora Goldman, 'A Comparison of the Genizah Manuscripts A and B of the Damascus Document in Light of Their Peshier Units,' in M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant (eds.) *Meghillot. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls IV*, Jerusalem: University of Haifa / Bialik Institute, 2006, pp. 169-189 (Hebrew, English abstract p. XIV).

<sup>35</sup> For the text of 4QS<sup>d</sup> VI-VII see Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, pp. 105-114.

Table: Visual Enhancement of Key Features in CD 20 and 1QS 8-9

Outlined:	Material shared by CD 20 and 1QS, chiefly the self-designation “people of perfect holiness”
<i>Italics:</i>	Language reminiscent of the shared terminology but not part of a self-designation (e.g. perfect conduct)
<b><i>Bold italics:</i></b>	Material distinctive in CD 20:1b-8a (e.g. “men of knowledge”,

---

<sup>36</sup> See J. J. Collins, ‘The Yahad and “The Qumran Community,”’ in Hempel and Lieu (eds.), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, esp. p. 89 and C. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, pp. 164-165, both of whom note how 1QS 9:3-11 recapitulate parts of 1QS 8. See also C. Hempel, ‘Emerging Communal Life and Ideology in the S Tradition,’ esp. p. 56.

<sup>37</sup> The connection through the catchword ׀ן is particularly clear in the shorter text of 4QS<sup>d</sup> VII:7, cf. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, pp. 110, 114.

	“upright ones”, “disciples of God”)
<b><u>Bold underlined:</u></b>	Language familiar from the organization of the communities in the Damascus Document and/or the Community Rule (e.g. <i>rabbim</i> , <i>yahad</i> , reproof, <i>tohorah</i> )
<u>Outline, bold, and underlined:</u>	Language found in the shared material and familiar from organizational texts (e.g. wealth)
<u>Double underlined:</u>	An expression unique in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls (i.e. community of holiness – יחד קודש)
<u>Dotted underlined:</u>	‘Context hooks’ i.e. bridging statements found just before the beginning (S) and at the end of the passage in question (D), i.e. CD 20:1 and 1QS 9:11 where both passages make reference to a messianic turning point. <sup>38</sup>
[ .... ]:	Text not quoted here

---

<sup>38</sup> Cf. the references in CD 20:1 “until the messiah of Aaron and Israel arises” and 1QS 9:11 “until the coming of the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel”.



## CD 20:1b-8a

(Translation by M. A. Knibb with minor changes)<sup>39</sup>

(20:1b) Such shall be the case (2) for everyone who enters / is a member of the congregation of the men of perfect holiness (כל עדת אנשי תמים ~ הקדש), but shrinks from carrying out the precepts of *the upright* (ישרים). (3) He is the man who is melted in a furnace. When his deeds become apparent, he shall be sent away from *the congregation* (מעדה) (4) like one whose lot had never fallen among *the disciples of God* (למודי אל). According to his unfaithfulness *the men of knowledge* (אנשי דעות) shall **reprove him** (יוכיחוהו) (5) until the day he again stands in the place (במעמד) of the men of perfect holiness (אנשי תמים קדש). (6) But when his deeds become apparent, according to the interpretation of the law (מדרש ה)

(תורה) (cf. מדרש התורה<sup>40</sup> in 1QS 8:15 // 4QS<sup>d</sup> VI:7 // 4QS<sup>e</sup> III:6) in which the men of perfect holiness (אנשי תמים הקדש) walk (7) let no man make any agreement with him in regard to property (הון) or work (עבודה), (8) because all the holy ones of the most high have cursed him.

---

<sup>39</sup> See Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, pp. 70-71. For the Hebrew text of CD see E. Qimron, 'The Text of CDC,' in M. Broshi (ed.), *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society / The Shrine of the Book / Israel Museum, 1992, pp. 9-49.

<sup>40</sup> 4QS<sup>e</sup> III:6 reads the masculine form of the pronoun (הוא), cf. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, pp. 144 and 146.

1QS 8:16-9:2; 9:8-11a<sup>41</sup>  
(Translation my own)<sup>42</sup>

(8:16b) No person from among **the people of the community, the covenant of** (17) **the community** (איש מאנשי היחד ברית<sup>17</sup> היחד), who fails to observe any of the commandments deliberately shall touch the **purity** (בטהרת) of the people of holiness (אנשי הקודש), (18) nor shall he have knowledge of any of **their counsel** (עצתם) until his actions have been cleansed from any injustice and *he conducts himself perfectly* (להלך בתמים דרך). Then they shall allow him to approach (19) **the council on the authority of the many** (בעצה על פי הרבים) and afterwards he shall be **enrolled** (יכתב) **according to his rank** (בתכוננו). This law shall apply to **everyone who joins the community** (כול הנוסף ליחדד). (20) These are the rules according to which the people of perfect holiness (אנשי התמים קודש) shall conduct themselves each one with his neighbour. (21) Every one who enters / is a member of the council of holiness (made up of) those whose conduct is perfect (כול הבא )

according to that which He has commanded, every person from among them (22) who has deliberately or inadvertently transgressed any part of the law of Moses **they shall send him away** from **the council of the community** (מעצת היחד) (23) **never to return again**. And no person from among the people of holiness (איש מאנשי הקודש) shall share

<sup>41</sup> Only 4QS<sup>d</sup> VI-VII offers some corresponding material from 4QS, cf. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, pp. 105-114.

<sup>42</sup> For an edition of the Hebrew text of 1QS see E. Qimron, 'Rule of the Community (1QS),' in J. H. Charlesworth *et al.* (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994, pp. 6ff.



### *Analysis*

Both passages clearly share a great deal of terminology while at the same time also preserving a fair number of distinctive features. What is particularly striking is the very distinctive use of the self-designation ‘the people of perfect holiness’ as a communal self-designation frequently in CD 20 and also in 1QS 8:20. This self-designation is not found anywhere else in the scrolls.<sup>43</sup> Carol Newsom recently coined

---

<sup>43</sup> On this terminology see Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, pp. 107f. See also Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document*, Atlanta, SBL, 2005 pp. 122-128 where she shows clearly that the contrast drawn in CD 7:4-6 is between those who walk in perfect holiness (obeying the rules of the small law code just preceding this reference) and those who despise. See also A.-M. Denis, *Les thèmes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas*, Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1967, pp. 135-138. Wassen’s interpretation has recently also been endorsed by Eyal Regev, cf. ‘Cherchez les femmes: Were the *yahad* Celibates?’, *DSD* 15 (2008): 253-284, esp. pp. 255-259. Much was made by previous scholars of a supposed dichotomy between those (implied: celibate individuals) who walk in perfect holiness and those who live in camps and marry and have children, see e.g. E. Qimron, ‘Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Two Kinds of Sectarians’, in J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18 -21 March 1991* (STDJ 11) Leiden, Brill, 1992, vol. I, pp. 286-294 and most recently Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, p. 165, see also p. 171. If Wassen is right, and I think her case is persuasive, then this passage could well speak of a similar conflict or crisis

the apt phrase “rhetoric of perfection” with reference to the Community Rule and noted also that the Damascus Document is the only other text that shares this rhetoric.<sup>44</sup> We noted earlier, moreover, that the shared material, here as elsewhere, is devoted to the larger *topos* of discipline.

On the other hand, there are clear differences too. The most striking feature to my mind is the internal evidence of the S passage. We seem to be looking at two sets of terminology side by side. One set of terms is very familiar from other parts of S (cf. *rabbim*, *yahad*) whereas the other self-designation (‘the people of perfect holiness’) does not occur elsewhere in S and is the one that resembles CD 20. Moreover, the more familiar S language (*rabbim* and *yachad*) is entirely lacking from the CD 20 passage. Particularly striking is the switch between both sets of terms in 1QS 8:19b-21 (“This law shall apply to everyone who joins the community [תן]. These are the rules according to which the people of perfect holiness shall conduct themselves each one with his neighbour. Every one who enters / is a member of the council of holiness (made up of) those whose conduct is perfect ...”). Also curious is the unique self-designation “community (*yahad*) of holiness” found only in 1QS 9:2 in the corpus of non-biblical scrolls. Given that this expression is a compound phrase which contains elements from both distinctive sets of terminology attested in the S passage, it seems plausible to speculate that it represents an attempt to bridge the terminological chasm

---

situation that also left its mark on CD 20:1b-8a. Wassen herself suggests that “the writer of XX,1b-8a may have used the language of CD VII 4-5 to highlight the desirable qualities of all the members.”, *Women in the Damascus Document*, pp. 124-125 n. 51.

<sup>44</sup> Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, pp. 159-160.

---

<sup>45</sup> On the close connection between wisdom literature and language and the Community Rule see the paper presented by R. G. Kratz at the most recent Orion symposium, 'Laws of Wisdom: Sapiential Traits in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS V–IX),' cf. <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/symposiums/12th/main.shtml>.

---

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, p. 112; C. Hempel, ‘The Literary Development of the S Tradition – A New Paradigm,’ in *RQ* 22 (2006): 389-401 and Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, pp. 102-103.

<sup>47</sup> On the sapiential roots of this language see recently Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community*, pp. 357-358 n. 86.

Furthermore the fact that 4QS<sup>e</sup> lacks all of this material and Eibert Tigchelaar's curious and revealing observation that parts of this section in 1QS display noticeable differences in the quantity of scribal corrections<sup>49</sup> all further point towards a staggered growth of the Community Rule at this point.<sup>50</sup> Are we right in thinking, then, that at exactly one juncture in the evolving literary growth of 1QS its textual tradition shows signs of an inter-textual relationship with CD MS B? Coupled with the fact that the passage in CD 20 we looked at is also almost certainly a late and somewhat extraneous development in CD/D, is it conceivable that both documents were worked on by the same group at one point? In other words rather than speaking of inter-textual links involving entire documents we might be dealing with inter-textual redactional layers. If Metso is correct and 4QS<sup>e</sup>'s much shorter text offers the

---

<sup>48</sup> On the unusual term "house of perfection" that occurs in the latter context, Marc Philonenko has recently written in his contribution to a *Festschrift* for Emile Puech noting some connections with Mandaean sources, cf. 'Sur les expressions "Maison fidèle en Israël," "Maison de vérité en Israël," "Maison de perfection et de vérité en Israël",' in Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar (eds.), *From 4QMMT to Resurrection. FS Emile Puech*, Leiden: Brill 2006, pp. 243-246.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Tigchelaar, 'The Scribe of 1QS.'

<sup>50</sup> On these issues see also C. Hempel, 'The Growth of Ancient Texts - An Example from Qumran', in M. Grossman (ed.), *How to Read the Dead Sea Scrolls: Methods and Theories in Scrolls Research*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, forthcoming.



more original text, then this Cave 4 manuscript may now present us with the sort of text the redactor responsible for 1QS worked with. If the same individual or school of thought lies behind CD 20:1b-8a onwards, it is worth noting the reference to the messiah of Aaron and Israel in CD 20:1a (identified graphically above as a ‘context hook’ [dotted underlined] which resembles the reference to a messianic turning point in 1QS 9:11 [until the coming of the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel]).<sup>51</sup> If both documents were adapted by the same circles – ‘a perfect holinessist crowd’ – then they may either have been inspired by CD 20:1a in drafting 1QS 9:11 or even been responsible for both.

### *Conclusion*

Just over a decade ago the full body of the ancient manuscripts of the Community Rule and the Damascus Document was published. It is therefore inevitable that scholars are still noticing finer points of overlap and difference and are struggling to make sense of an immensely complex, challenging and exciting body of evidence. We began by noting the preponderance of inter-textual passages in D and S, relating in particular to disciplinary issues, and suggested that the communities seemed to have struggled with ‘commitment issues’ at the time when passages like the penal code and CD 20:1b-8 and 1QS 8:16-9:11 were composed. Although the penal codes frequently refer to what may be described as rather mundane infringements such as falling asleep during a meeting, it is worth stressing that they also make reference to some very

---

<sup>51</sup> Hultgren argues the CD 20:1 is an introduction to a section now lost, cf. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community*, pp. 67-76.

serious offences that strike at the heart of the community's survival, cp., e.g., 1QS 7:17-19. In revisiting the close and curious inter-textual relationship between CD 20:1b-8a and 1QS 8:16-9:2; 9:8-11a // 4QS<sup>d</sup> VI-VII we were able to reflect not only on the relationship between both documents to one another but also tried to evaluate the internal complexities of each text. This internal complexity emerged as particularly evident in the Community Rule where four rather different types of evidence were drawn upon:

- 1QS 8:16-9:2; 9:8-11a // 4QS<sup>d</sup> VI-VII shares a particular terminological frame of reference with CD 20:1b-8a that is not found elsewhere in the *Serekh*.
- Alongside the language shared with CD 20, 1QS 8-9 also employs communal self-designations and organizational terminology that predominates in the central columns of 1QS (esp. 1QS 5-7) such as *rabbim* and *yachad*.
- A complex literary history behind 1QS 8-9 is further suggested by the evidence of 4QS<sup>e</sup> which lacks the equivalent of 1QS 8:15b-9:11 altogether. It seems commendable, or essential even, to relate the scholarly discussion on the shorter text of 4QS<sup>e</sup> vis-à-vis 1QS to the close relationship between the longer 1QS text and CD 20:1b-8a.
- Furthermore, both Tigchelaar and Newsom have recently drawn attention to the significance of the level of scribal corrections in 1QS 8. Tigchelaar rightly draws our attention to the variations in the level of correctional activity in different parts of 1QS 8 noting especially the small number of corrections in 1QS 8:15-9:11 – exactly the same portion of text missing from 4QS<sup>e</sup>. He correctly observes that, “the accumulation of errors and corrections in specific

sections may reflect a complicated textual tradition.”<sup>52</sup> Newsom’s observations point in the same direction: “The extensive interlinear corrections of 1QS 8 also lend an impression of considerable scribal activity, although the actual history of the development may never be resolved. The result, however, is a mosaic-like effect of thematically related but verbally distinguishable units.”<sup>53</sup>

Newsom is surely right when she notes that we can never retrace precisely the literary history behind 1QS 8-9. What I hope to have shown is that a careful comparison between 1QS 8-9 and CD 20 provides us with further, vital evidence when we contemplate the textual mosaic of 1QS 8-9.

---

<sup>52</sup> Tigchelaar, ‘The Scribe of 1QS,’ p. 451.

<sup>53</sup> *The Self as Symbolic Space*, p. 152.